REMARKS

In view of the following discussion, the Applicants submit that none of the claims now pending in the application is obvious under the provisions of 35 U.S.C. §103. Thus, the Applicants believe that all of the presented claims are in condition for allowance.

I. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1-2, 4-9, 11-13, AND 32 UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103

The Examiner rejects claims 1-2, 4-9, 11-13, and 32 as being unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over the Grindrod patent (U.S. Patent No. 6,868,413, issued March 15, 2005, hereinafter referred to as "Grindrod") in view of the Sluiman et al. patent (U.S. Patent No. 6,590,589, issued July 8, 2003, hereinafter "Sluiman") and further in view of the Burns et al. patent (United States Patent No. 6,694,053, issued February 17, 2004, hereinafter "Burns"). In response, the Applicants have amended independent claims 1 and 32 in order to more clearly recite aspects of the present invention. Claim 4 has been cancelled without prejudice.

The Examiner's attention is respectfully directed to the fact that Grindrod, Sluiman, and Burns, singly or in any permissible combination, fail to teach or suggest the novel invention of designating a customizable element of a set as a customizable template <u>by inserting a template modifier before the customizable element in source code for the rule-based application</u> and then <u>customizing said customizable element under instruction from a second end user different from the first end user</u>, as recited in Applicants' independent claims 1 and 32.

By contrast, Grindrod teaches a method for building business logic rules, but does not teach a method for <u>creating a templates</u> used in building these rules. More specifically, Grindrod does not teach a method by which customizable data may be designated or identified <u>prior to presenting a user interface</u> for building a rule containing the customizable data. Thus, Grindrod clearly cannot teach that the customizable data is designated specifically <u>by inserting a template modifier before the customizable data in source code</u> for the rule-based application, as claimed by the Applicants. Grindrod also does not specifically disclose that a first end user designates the customizable elements of a rule-based application and that a different, second end user actually

performs the customization by selecting values for the customizable elements, as also claimed by the Applicants.

Sluiman and Burns both fail to bridge this gap in the teachings of Grindrod. Specifically, although Sluiman does teach a method for generating a customizable template, Sluiman fails to disclose that the customizable elements of the template are designated specifically <u>by inserting a template modifier before the customizable data in source code</u> for the rule-based application, as claimed by the Applicants. Instead, as taught by Sluiman, a user selects elements from a list of macros, and designates these elements as "editable" in a drop down box.

Burns teaches a method for analyzing document structure in accordance with a set of editable rules, but, like Grindrod, does not specifically disclose how portions of these rules are designated as editable. Thus, Burns also clearly cannot teach that the editable portions of the rules are designated specifically <u>by inserting a template modifier before the editable portions in source code</u> for the rule-based application, as claimed by the Applicants.

The Applicants clearly claim a method in which portions of a rule-based application are designated as customizable prior to actual customization of the rule-based application. In particular, a user can designate certain elements (*e.g.*, rulesets, rules, or variables) of the application as customizable by inserting a template modifier in the application source code prior to the elements. Then, when a ruleset comprising the application is parsed, any elements that have a template modifier appearing before them are flagged or marked as templates to signify that they can be used as customization points by later users. For example, a ruleset marked as customizable can be used to generate an entirely new ruleset; a variable marked as customizable can be used as a customization point in other ruleset elements; and rules marked as customizable can be used to generate new rules. Specifically, Applicants' claims 1 and 32 positively recite:

> 1.   A method of customizing a rule-based application, the method comprising:
>   designating a customizable element of a set as a customizable template <u>by inserting a template modifier before the customizable element in source code for the rule-based application</u>, the customizable element being selected by a first end-user;

compiling said customizable element into at least one object to form a ruleset;

parsing said set to detect said customizable element designated as a customizable template;

customizing said customizable element under instruction from a second end user different from the first end user; and

enabling editing of said rule-based application during runtime processing of said ruleset in an environment in which said rule-based application executes. (Emphasis added)

32.   A method of customizing a rule-based application, the method comprising:

designating a customizable element of a set as a customizable template by inserting a template modifier before the customizable element in source code for the rule-based application, the customizable element being selected by a first end-user, where the customizable element is one of: a variable, a rule, or a ruleset;

compiling said customizable element into at least one object to form a ruleset;

parsing said set to detect said customizable element designated as a customizable template;

customizing said customizable element under instruction from a second end user different from the first end user; and

editing said customizable element during runtime processing of said ruleset in an environment in which the rule-based application executes, where said editing comprises generating a new ruleset from a customizable ruleset template, and where a pre-existing customizable rule template is associated with said new ruleset and is unchanged. (Emphasis added)

Since Grindrod, in view of Sluiman and further in view of Burns fails to teach or suggest designating a customizable element of a set as a customizable template by inserting a template modifier before the customizable element in source code for the rule-based application and then customizing said customizable element under instruction from a second end user different from the first end user, Grindrod, in view of Sluiman and further in view of Burns does not teach or suggest each and every element of Applicants' claims 1 and 32. Moreover, dependent claims 2, 4-9, and 11-13 depend, either directly or indirectly, from independent claim 1 and recite at least all of the

patentable features recited in claim 1. As such, and for at least the same reasons set forth above with respect to independent claim 1, the Applicants submit that claims 2, 5-9, and 11-13 are also not obvious and are allowable.

Therefore, Applicants contend that claims 1-2, 5-9, and 11-13, and 32 are patentable over Grindrod, in view of Sluiman and further in view of Burns and, as such, fully satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §103. Thus, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 1-2, 5-9, 11-13, and 32 under 35 U.S.C. §103 be withdrawn.

II. NEW CLAIMS

The Applicants have added new claims 33-36, which depend, either directly or indirectly, from independent claim 1 and recite at least all of the patentable features recited in claim 1. As such, new claims 33-36 are believed to be allowable for at least the same reasons that independent claim 1 is believed to be allowable.

III. CONCLUSION

Thus, the Applicants submit that all of the presented claims fully satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §103. Consequently, the Applicants believe that all of these claims are presently in condition for allowance. Accordingly, both reconsideration of this application and its swift passage to issue are earnestly solicited.

If, however, the Examiner believes that there are any unresolved issues requiring the issuance of a final action in any of the claims now pending in the application, it is requested that the Examiner telephone Kin-Wah Tong, Esq. at (732) 842-8110 so that appropriate arrangements can be made for resolving such issues as expeditiously as possible.

Respectfully submitted,

December 28, 2009

Wall & Tong, LLP
595 Shrewsbury Avenue
Shrewsbury, New Jersey 07702

Kin-Wah Tong, Attorney
Reg. No. 39,400
(732) 842-8110